

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-2, 6-7, 9-12, and 15-24 are currently pending. In this Response, Applicants have amended certain claims. In light of the Office Action, Applicants believe these amendments serve a useful clarification purpose, and are desirable for clarification purposes, independent of patentability. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments do not limit the range of any permissible equivalents.

In particular, independent claim 15 has been rewritten and various claims depending therefrom have been rewritten or canceled to maintain consistency with the language now recited in the independent claim. In addition, claims 26-28 have been added to recite embodiments of the invention previously recited in claim 18. As no new matter has been added, Applicants respectfully request entry of these amendments at this time.

### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of claims 1-2, 6-7, 9-12, and 20-23. In addition, Applicants appreciated the Examiner's recognition of allowable subject matter in claims 18 and 24-25. In response, claim 15 has been rewritten to include the subject matter previously recited in now-canceled claim 25.

### **THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103**

Claims 15-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,123,061 to Dusbiber ("Dusbiber") or U.S. Patent No. 6,309,313 to Peter ("Peter") or U.S. Patent No. 4,124,573 to Watabe ("Watabe").

As acknowledged by the Examiner, "[t]he references do not suggest that the isocyanate is a trimer or that the curing agent is [one] of the specific triamines recited in claim 25." Office Action at Page 3. As such, claim 15 has been rewritten to incorporate the features previously recited in now-canceled claim 25. In addition, claims 26-28 have been added to incorporate some of the features previously recited in claim 18, *i.e.*, specifically requiring the isocyanate in the prepolymer to be a trimer.

In light of these amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections based on Dusbiber, Peter, and Watabe.

### CONCLUSION

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the present amendments still do not resolve all of the issues regarding patentability of the pending claims, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorneys to discuss any remaining issues.

A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith to extend the time for response three months to and including September 8, 2006. In addition, a Fee Sheet Transmittal is submitted to authorize the charge for the additional claims added with this Response.

No other fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any fee be required, however, please charge such fee to Bingham McCutchen LLP Deposit Account No. 195127, Order No. 20002.0329.

Respectfully submitted,

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

Dated: September 1, 2006

By: Stephanie D. Scruggs

Stephanie D. Scruggs, Registration No. 54,432

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20007

(202) 373-6755 Telephone

(202) 295-8478 Facsimile